

HERALD OF FREEDOM.

Terms—Two Dollars Per Annum—In Advance.

BY G. W. BROWN & CO.

The Herald of Freedom.

GEO. W. BROWN, Editor.

LAWRENCE, KANSAS.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, APRIL 24, 1858.

TERMS—\$2.00 PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.

Something in the Wind.

The *Cruiser of Freedom*, henceforth, will not be the organ of any party, or of any man, the Editor alone excepted, and will refuse to support any ticket or any official aspirant who does not announce himself openly as a Republican. Regarding the Free State party as an organized hypocrisy—kept up solely for the purpose of promoting the political designs of a number of ambitious demagogues, all ready to fight under that banner longer but will hoist the Republican flag.

Having now received a local support, we will hereafter give more attention to the interests of the city and county. The above we find in the *Cruiser of Freedom* of March 25th, and must confess we are not a little surprised. Once we thought that the *Cruiser* was established to maintain the Free State party and its principles, but now we know it is not. We, for a moment, cannot believe it is right to abandon our ship, in a very hour of peril, to let her drift and the rocks and sand banks in this sea. It is certain destruction. Can we, for the sake of a few thousand freemen, permit for five thousand freemen to be persecuted for four long years, has been sustained by "an organized hypocrisy," as he persuades fifteen thousand freemen, composed of Republicans, Democrats and men, united for the defence of their liberties, that he has been "nearly" to "hold the Republican flag," and that they should abandon and give it up?

Does he presume that the freemen of Kansas will abandon to shame that blood-stained banner under which they have fought, and under which they have fought, because some disappointed fanatic dares speak contemptuously of it? Does not the declaration that he has been "nearly" to "hold the Republican flag," and that they should abandon and give it up? Does he presume that the freemen of Kansas will abandon to shame that blood-stained banner under which they have fought, and under which they have fought, because some disappointed fanatic dares speak contemptuously of it? Does not the declaration that he has been "nearly" to "hold the Republican flag," and that they should abandon and give it up?

It should be remembered that the *Cruiser of Freedom* was edited by James Redpath, known outside of this Territory as the first Kansas correspondent of the *Democratic*, and subsequently as the correspondent of the *New York Tribune* and the *Chicago Tribune*. It will not be recollected that he is one of the most and most vindictive men in the world, an Englishman who, it is said, refused to take the oath of allegiance to our government because of his Pro-slavery character. He is said to be an avowed Unionist, and an imitator of Wm. Lloyd Garrison in everything but his morality. During the last year, Redpath has written a column after column denouncing the *Herald of Freedom* and its editor; representing that he had deserted the Free State party, sold out to Walker, gone over to the enemy; he has employed all the insinuation, through his correspondence, and subsequently through his paper of which he was master. The Republican press, with the view of striking a blow at the *Herald*, lauded the *Cruiser of Freedom* as a reliable paper, one which Free State men could place confidence in, and which would never betray them!

Great God! His paper was published about three months. After having lived in "illustrated lies," as we stated a few weeks ago it died envenomed in a lie that the Free State party was no more; that the object of its mission was accomplished, and that the party was an "organized hypocrisy."

We congratulate the Free State party on account of his desertion. Let the world understand that he "refuses to fight longer under the Free State flag," and let Free State men treat him as traitors should always be treated!

Thacker, Intan, Phillips, Ross, are all leading in the same direction. They are all laboring to raise the Republican banner, and are striving to make devotion to that party a test of political orthodoxy. This has been the direction they have been giving to the Free State party for months. Let the world understand that we follow no such lead until Kansas is safely moored in the Union Free State, and that we will oppose such an organization, or the proscription of those who are laboring to make this an issue with all the zeal we can command; that when this issue is forced upon the party by the kind lead of demagogues, that we will invite the Free State men to drive the rats from the ship—go from it we will not. We stand upon the Big Springs platform, with no other test of party fealty than freedom for Kansas. He who attempts to force other issues upon the country and the party, must suffer the consequences. It is for that reason we now arrange James Redpath as a traitor, and the "chink, chink," which he represented us as being governed by, controls him, and has sent him to political perdition.

For the Herald of Freedom.

LAWRENCE, K. T., April 18, 1858.

ED. HERALD OF FREEDOM—DEAR SIR:

I see in Thacker's correspondence from the Leavenworth Convention, he says: "S. N. Wood said in caucus that Douglas county did not want the President of the Convention." I am surprised that the friends of Judge Conway should attempt to arraign me for opposing the Judges election as President of the Constitutional Convention, but so it is, and a word of explanation from me may not be amiss.

When the Constitutional Convention met at Minneola it was evident that the Convention would adjourn to some other point. All supposed that point would be Lawrence or Topeka. An informal ballot was had without a choice, as members, as is common on such occasions, voted mostly for the local places of their residences. The second ballot commenced, and whilst the friends of Lawrence expected a concentration of votes upon that place of all opposed to Topeka, what was our surprise to see Conway leading off in favor of Topeka, deserting our own town and people. Topeka carried, but such was the feeling, that the vote was reconsidered and the convention agreed to meet at Leavenworth. It was also understood soon after meeting at Minneola that Gen. Lane desired a complimentary election as President of the Convention and would immediately resign.

Lane was elected President and Conway voted for Topeka. After we met at Leavenworth the question arose who should be elected President of the Convention. The particular friends of Topeka claimed that they were entitled to the Presidency having yielded and agreed to the meeting of the Convention at Leavenworth, and in caucus nominated M. F. Conway, the "Young Man Elloquent." A member of the convention from Leavenworth stated in open convention that Topeka had yielded the convention to them, and that no Leavenworth man ought to ask the position of President.

I did state in a private caucus, the proceedings of which all honorable men should have kept secret, that "the majority of the Delegates from this district did not ask the office of President of the Convention here." I felt that Lawrence had been deserted and sold by one of her Delegates for the purpose of making that same Delegate President of the Convention, the public was sacrificed to self, and of course, as a citizen of Lawrence, I withheld my support and if it will be any satisfaction to the Judge or his friends, I will just mention that in this position I was sustained by not only a majority of the Delegates from this district, but from this county and city. Yours truly, S. N. WOOD.

Where is Joseph M'Guire?

MA. ENRON:—While in Wisconsin the past winter, I learned that a man by the name of JOSEPH M'GUIRE, with his family, started from Omro, Wis., for Kansas and has not been heard from since. By the death of a relative in England an annuity has fallen to him. He is a stranger to me, but if you would put a notice in your paper, stating the fact, he would no doubt be greatly benefited by the information. Yours &c. L. J. MILLER.

Townley House.

This is rapidly acquiring a popularity and standing as one of the first hotels in St. Louis. It is a new building—large, commodious and airy—and is situated on Fourth street, between Olive and Locust, in the most fashionable as well as the healthiest and most pleasant portion of the Missouri City. Ladies who visit St. Louis on that all important business—shopping—are especially recommended to put up at the Townley House, as it is right in the midst of the largest and most fashionable retail stores. —Altos Courier.

Thatcher voted in the Constitutional Convention against inserting the word "white" as a qualification of a voter, and voted against striking out the word "male." Thatcher evidently believed negroes better than white men.

Meeting at Twin Mound—A Voice against the Land Sale.

Intelligence having been received regarding sure, what before had been but a painful rumor, that the sale of lands in Kansas Territory had actually been ordered by the Government, the settlers in the neighborhood of Twin Mound, anxious to save themselves from having their homes and unrepented claims brought into market at so early a date, met at Twin Mound House, on Friday, April 16th, 1858, at 4 o'clock P. M., to counsel together in this crisis of affairs, and give expression to their views on the all-absorbing topic. Philip T. Hupp, Esq., was called to the chair, and Henry Hiatt appointed Secretary.

William Denton briefly stated the object of the meeting to be, to devise what we can do to secure the postponement of this land sale. On motion, O. H. Browne, Esq., Joseph Treat and Henry M. Greene, were appointed a Business Committee, who thereupon reported the following resolutions:

WHEREAS, The President of the United States has issued his proclamation, providing for the sale of unrepented lands in Doniphan and Leecompton Districts, in the Territory of Kansas, said sale to take place on the 5th and 19th of July next;—

AND WHEREAS, These lands have been only a short time open for pre-emption, and thus but the space of a very few months will be allowed to actual settlers, to secure themselves in the possession of their homes; therefore,

Resolved, That we hear with deep concern and just alarm of this proposed measure, which so eminently threatens to deprive us of the fruit of all our toils and sufferings in coming to this Territory.

Resolved, That the people of these Districts—the hardy pioneers in the settlement of this part of Kansas—are utterly unprepared for the sale thus announced in the President's proclamation.

Resolved, That if said sale takes effect, at the time specified, thousands of the honest, industrious, and loyal citizens of Kansas, unable to redeem the claims they have in good faith taken and improved, will be compelled to look on and see those claims sold from under them, and given up into the hands of speculators and non-residents, who will thereby injure the homes sacrificed, to those who never had the least particle of right to them.

Resolved, That we protest against this result, not only in the name of all these multitudes who will be so wronged, but with all the earnestness and force of our position to prove inimical to the interests of the universal community.

Resolved, That the disappearance of so many of the actual settlers from Kansas, and the giving up the fairest portions of this soil to money-grabbers and land-mongers, both of which must inevitably follow from this contemplated sale, cannot but prove a serious and lasting injury to the interests of this Territory, in retarding its speedy settlement; so that even as a Government measure, the sale must demonstrate itself unwise and impolitic, but more directly and surely defeating its own ends.

Resolved, That this meeting prefers an earnest request to the Land Department at Leecompton, to represent to the proper authority at Washington, the true state of the case in this Territory; and in the name of the people, and in accordance with their most anxious prayers, to use all possible influence to induce a postponement of the sale of lands in this District.

Resolved, That we call upon the inhabitants of the neighboring settlements, and all the people of these two Districts where, in the sale is ordered, to make common cause with us in this matter; to meet in their respective localities, give public expression to their sentiments, and transmit a record of the same to their various journals, and (if judged necessary), to the Land Departments in their several Districts.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, authenticated by the President and Secretary, be forwarded for publication in the *Leavenworth Republican*, *Herald of Freedom*, and *Kansas National Democrat*, with request to all other papers in the Territory to copy, and also to Hon. Ely Moore, Register of the Land Office at Leecompton.

There was no room for discussion on the resolutions, every voice was already and heartily in their favor; but spirited remarks were made by Joseph Treat, O. H. Browne, H. M. Greene, Wm. Denton, H. Hiatt, Mr. McKinney, E. Smith, and others, and then the resolutions were put and unanimously carried.

On motion of H. Hiatt,

Resolved, That the fact that there has been a general understanding on the part of the people of Kansas, that their claims were to be offered for public sale during the present Administration, is a strong additional reason for putting off the sale now ordered; since, in consequence of that understanding, very many claimants are not now prepared to pre-empt, who otherwise might and would have been.

Voted, to adjourn to meet in this place, three weeks from to-day, at 1 o'clock P. M.

The meeting was got up on short and insufficient notice, but was largely attended, some being present from five miles away. With suitable notice, the number would have been doubled.

PHILIP T. HUPP, Pres't.,

HENRY HIATT, Sec'y.

Growth of the City of St. Louis.

The progress of the city of St. Louis is one of the most remarkable facts in our history. In 1764 the site was pitched upon, and a trading settlement for the trappers of the West was commenced. For fifteen years before the year 1824, the fur trade was brought here for sale averaged annually the sum of \$200,000. Not more than 200 people made their homes here, and half of them were roving traders. As late as 1820 the population did not exceed 5,000, and in 1830 it was less than 7,000; in 1840 it was 16,469; in 1850 it counted up to 77,650; and now there are more than one hundred thousand people. It spreads along the river about seven miles, and extends over two plateaus, the one twenty feet, and the other sixty feet above the river.

Gov. Walker to the Democracy of New Jersey.

HOBOKEN, N. J., March 27, 1858.

GENTLEMEN:—I regret that it is not in my power to accept your kind invitation to address the Democracy of Sussex County, New Jersey, at the meeting called for Tuesday next, to express their opposition to the Leecompton Constitution.

That is an appropriate name for that instrument, for it is not the Constitution of the State of Kansas. The Constitution of a State is its first great fundamental law—their Magna Charta—not embodying, however, rights, as mere privileges granted by royal power, either to loyal or rebellious subjects, but as the free will of the people themselves. By that people it must be fairly and freely made, and by them presented for the acceptance of Congress; and if it be not the will of the people of Kansas, it is not the Constitution of Kansas, whatever specious forms, or fraudulent devices, or transparent forgeries, it may be forced upon us. The Leecompton Constitution is not a State Constitution, for that can only be fairly and freely made by the people of a State; but it is a wretched counterfeit, sought to be forced by violence, fraud and forgery, upon the Delaware, which separated her from my own native Pennsylvania. I have thought that here, amid your mountain homes, Liberty might find her last entrenchment, and that some of your plains and passes might become as distinguished in defense of popular sovereignty as the classic fields of Grecian or Roman history, or the more recent struggles of the heroic Swiss. May you never have cause to encounter such fearful sacrifices; but if the trial must come, may you fully realize my highest anticipations of the courage and patriotism of the people of Sussex, New Jersey. Most respectfully, your fellow-citizen,

R. J. WALKER.

For the Herald of Freedom.

CORRECTION.

PARIS, LINX COUNTY, April 3, 1858.

G. W. BROWN—DEAR SIR:—I notice in your paper bearing date 20th March, 1858, the publication of an article headed "An exposition of the Bourbon county difficulties," over the signature of "CHAMBERLAIN." My name having been used in that article as one of the officials of Linx County, I feel it my duty to correct any misrepresentation in regard to my action in the premises, and statements in said article, of my own knowledge. I know nothing of the statements contained in said article, neither do I know any of the persons therein named, nor have I the slightest acquaintance with either of them, save Montgomery, who is a citizen of this county. So far as the writs therein mentioned, purporting to be issued by me, are concerned, it is without the shadow of a foundation. I issued no such writs, nor any of that character, either for the persons therein mentioned, nor any other person. I deem it my duty to make this correction, and hope you will do me the favor to permit me, through your paper, to set myself right before the country, or to correct any misrepresentation, through the columns of your paper in regard to my official conduct. Yours respectfully,

D. W. CANNON.

A Chance that People may get Cheated.

The introduction of a new metal, says the Boston *Traveler*, called "Oreide," formed by the combination of several metallic substances, and strikingly resembling gold. It was first produced in France and is brought here under a patent. A company in Connecticut are now manufacturing from this material. It resembles gold very closely, and is so perfect that which has been recently sold for gold-chased plate, is nothing but Oreide. The cost of this material is about eighty cents per pound, and yet its appearance is such, that it would be readily taken for gold by casual observers. It is not a pure metal, but a compound of several metals, refused to such a degree, that it does not oxidize or tarnish. These qualities make it a valuable acquisition to the metallic arts. When tested with nitric acid, bullion takes place, but no spot remains. This quality though valuable for utensils, makes it a dangerous metal for dishonest men. It can be used for counterfeiting gold so readily, that it will be exceedingly difficult to detect the counterfeit from the true. When placed side by side with gold, it requires close scrutiny to decide which is gold, and which is Oreide. In France a law has already been passed to prevent frauds, by compelling, under severe penalties for neglect, all the manufacturers of "Oreide" to stamp the word upon the articles produced.

Some of our conscientious Solons and would-be great men, have recently engaged in an arduous undertaking—that of rebuking speculation. These new-fledged philosophers propose revolutionizing the entire nature of man, and eradicating therefrom all desire or inclination to make money. They intend to teach all public officers to be strictly honest, and not to take advantage of their positions for the acquisition of wealth. While we confess that this is a laudable undertaking, we have our doubts about its success. It is too much like Satan rebuking sin to be entirely successful. This squeamishness about acknowledging what a man works for is all nonsense. We work for pay and so do other men; and there is no use of denying it. Men will speculate when they have an opportunity, and it cannot be hindered; therefore this paroxysm of conscientious honesty that has recently seized upon some of our Kansas politicians, that egotistical expressions, that "I am holier than thou," are senseless and useless. Men, as long as they breathe, will speculate; if they can get an opportunity, and no power can hinder.—*Centinel's Leader*.

The weather is fine as we write.

Lawrence, Kansas, April 24, 1858.

THE KANSAS

TRAIL

"TRUTH CRUSHED TO EARTH SHALL RISE AGAIN."

WASHINGTON CITY, March 6, 1858.

MESSRS. H. B. PATNE AND OTHERS, CORRESPONDENTS:—Your letter of the 22nd ult., has been received, inviting me to attend and address a mass meeting of the Democracy of Ohio on the 10th of this month. I regret that it will be impossible for me to be with you on that occasion, but most cordially concur in the great object of your meeting.

For the first time in our history an effort is now made to force a Constitution and Government upon an inchoate State, against the well-known will of a large majority of its people. Nothing can be more clear or conclusive than the evidence demonstrating the fact that an overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas are opposed to the Leecompton Constitution. This is indicated by the disfranchisement of half the counties of Kansas in the election of delegates to the Constitutional Convention; by the skeleton vote given to those delegates, averaging not more than thirty for each; by the withholding of the Constitution by the Convention, against their well-known pledges, from the people; by the result of the election of the Territorial Legislature in October last when both parties participated; by the miserable frauds and forgeries perpetrated by the minority, to supply the place of real electors; and finally rendered certain by a majority of the votes against the Constitution, in the election, held on the 4th of January last. This last vote was taken under the call of the Territorial Legislature of Kansas, the same authority by which the Convention was assembled, and this law was enacted by that Legislature, before any vote had been taken by the people on the Leecompton Constitution. Now the Convention derived its authority exclusively from an act passed by the Territorial Legislature, under the comprehensive powers vested in that body by Congress; but before the act of the Convention was consummated by a popular vote, and whilst as yet the whole proceedings were inchoate, the Territorial Legislature, by a valid law, authorized the people to vote for or against the Constitution. The vote under that law indicated an undisputed majority of more than ten thousand people of Kansas against the Leecompton Constitution. Indeed one of the reasons given why the Leecompton Constitution should be rejected by the people, is that it had been submitted to a vote of the people, it would have been rejected by them at the polls.

The fact then is proven incontrovertibly, that a majority of the people of Kansas are opposed to the Leecompton Constitution, and that if this Constitution is forced upon the people, it will be forced upon that people against their will. This is the great controlling fact that stands out in bold relief, and thus presents a case involving that fundamental principle of public liberty, and of the Constitution, shall a proved and admitted minority seek to establish a Constitution, and Government for the people of an inchoate State? The great doctrine of State rights and State sovereignty lies at the foundation of all our institutions. The most vital of all the rights of a State is the establishment of a Constitution, and if this right can be disregarded by Congress, the whole doctrine of popular sovereignty and State is discarded and overturned. In doing such an act, we are setting a most fatal precedent; we are undermining the very pillars upon which repose the whole fabric of popular liberty; we are permitting a small minority to supersede a majority in framing a State Government, and Congress is becoming the difference between Democracy and Oligarchy. Monarchy and Despotism. It is the first and I fear the last step towards the overthrow of our free institutions; and if this can be done now, and by an authority so high as Congress, what will be the demand next made by the minority? Shall they then overthrow the Constitution, and set up a new one? Shall they then overthrow the Government, and set up a new one? Shall they then overthrow the Constitution, and set up a new one? Shall they then overthrow the Government, and set up a new one?

Ohio entered the Union as a sovereign State; there she stands in the proud attitude of a State, and she has the right to be heard by the glad voices of more than two millions of freemen and she intends that in like manner Kansas shall come into the confederacy, by the free will only of a majority of her people. Ohio will not sanction the violation of the elective franchise. She will not stultify her bright intellect by the perpetration of frauds, and she will not commit a pollution upon the most sacred rights for which her fathers fought and conquered in the days of the Revolution, but will transmit the priceless heritage of self-government, in all its original brightness and entirety, to her remotest posterity. She has chosen the path of justice, and in the cause of truth, of justice, and of freedom, and a glorious victory awaits your efforts. Most respectfully, your fellow-citizen,

R. J. WALKER.

A dispatch from Washington, dated April 1st, says:—

The Senate has not yet notified the House of its adverse action on Montgomery's substitute. Notice is expected tomorrow. In the event of the failure of the Kansas bill to be made from the Democratic side to couple Kansas with Minnesota, making the admission of one depend on the other.

Kansas can beat the world for Governors, Legislatures, Constitutions and Elections. During the last year we have had three of the first, three of the second and three of the third, and even of the last. Voting is getting to be an intolerable nuisance, the people being weary of attending, and growing entirely indifferent as to the results. Too much of a good thing is equally as injurious as none at all.—*Centinel's Leader*.

The weather is fine as we write.

crimes like these. Would we not become accomplices of these crimes if we should aid in the establishment of a Government based upon them? If success can be achieved by these and kindred atrocities, and the high sanction of Congress can be obtained for them, do we not open forever the flood-gates of vice and immorality? Republics are based upon public virtue, and when this is subverted, the vital spark of liberty will have been extinguished. The parchment upon which the Constitution is written may still remain, but the life-giving principles of popular freedom and public virtue will have gone forever.

But although the justice of the principles for which we contend may be admitted by our adversaries, yet it is contended that it is expedient to proceed as they now in Kansas. The sanction of crime and injustice can never be expedient. We should never do wrong, in the hope, perhaps, vain and illusory, that it may be hereafter corrected. We should do always what is right and just, in all our acts, whether in public or in private, and seek to have the shrine of the overruling Providence, who can never give his sanction or ultimate success to crimes or injustice. The Territorial Legislature of Kansas is now in the hands of a majority of her people. The control was obtained in October last, in an election in which both parties participated, and free-lecompton Constitution be defeated, and the Territorial Government so long as it exists, will be conducted in peace and quiet, until it is superseded by a Constitution legally framed under a call of the Territorial Legislature, ratified by the people, and adopted by Congress, all which may be done in a few weeks or months, and the great doctrine of popular sovereignty have been vindicated.

But force this Constitution upon the people of Kansas now against their will, and no mortal vision can penetrate the dark abyss in which lay hidden the deep disasters now menacing Kansas and our country. I cannot take this dark leap into such a vortex of crime and uncertainty. But the people of Kansas submit, and the great doctrine of popular sovereignty have been vindicated. But force this Constitution upon the people of Kansas now against their will, and no mortal vision can penetrate the dark abyss in which lay hidden the deep disasters now menacing Kansas and our country. I cannot take this dark leap into such a vortex of crime and uncertainty. But the people of Kansas submit, and the great doctrine of popular sovereignty have been vindicated.

These are facts that demand the consideration of the people of all parties. Is any country safe, when such an institution as the one referred to is subduing alike, great and small, and bringing one and all to a beastly level.

Salvations.

Whithersoever we go we meet with the sniveller. He stops us at the corner of the street to entreat us with his opinion. He fears that the morals and intelligence of the people are destroyed by the election of a man to office. He tells us, just before church, that the last sermon of some transcendental preacher has given the death blow to religion, and that the clouds of pantheism are to deluge and darken all the land. In a time of general health he speaks of the pestilence that is to be. The mail carries the news of a collision between the Great Northern and the Chicago and North Western, and steamboat disasters. He fears that his friend, who was married yesterday, will be bankrupt in a year, and whimper over the trials which he will then endure. He is ridden with an eternal nightmare, and emits an eternal wail. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope; but neither is so degrading as inglorious and inactive despair. We object to the sniveller, because he presents the anomaly of a being who has the power of motion without possessing life. His insipid languor is worse than timid strength. He is a sniveller, and so is blind and extravagant hope